DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 309 PS 009 418

AUTHOR	Johnson, Cleo; Goodwin, Judy
TITLE	Report of Program Personnel's Perceptions of the Follow Through Expansion Program in Philadelphia, 1975-1976.
INSTITUTION	Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	77126
PUB DATE	Feb 77
GRANT	OEG-G-007-502-171
NOTE	89p.; For related documents, see PS 009 419-420
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Compensatory Education Programs; Elementary Education; Parent Participation; *Primary Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Rating Scales; Teacher Aides; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education; Training
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This document, part of a series of reports on the Philadelphia Follow Through Expansion Program, provides perceptions of program impact. One focus of this report is on (1) pre-program data collected in the summer, 1975 for first grade teachers; in the summer, 1976 for second grade teachers, and in the fall, 1976 for second grade aides. The second part of the report focuses on (2) a survey conducted in the spring, 1976 of the total program assessing program personnel's perceptions towards the Expansion Program after one year of program operation. Included under pre-program data are background characteristics, pre-program input and pre-post training. The Expansion Program survey covers background characteristics, educational ideals, academic areas, staff development, preschool experience, parent involvement, program impact and continuation of the Expansion Program. There are also pre-post Expansion Program comparisons, original Follow Through and Expansion Program comparisons, and a summary. Appendices contain detailed data tables, rating scales and other quantitative information. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT OF PROGRAM PERSONNEL'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION PROGRAM IN PHILADELPHIA 1975-1976

ED142309

Report Prepared by:

Cleo Johnson
and
Judy Goodwin

Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

February, 1977
Report #77126

Grant Number G 007 502 171

Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Programs

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Constance E. Clayton
Executive Director
Early Childhood Programs

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

PS009418

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Lawrence Boonin

Mr. George Hutt

Robert M. Sebastian, Esq.

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

****

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Dr. Robert L. Poindexter, Executive Deputy Superintendent

****

Dr. I. Ezra Staples
Deputy Superintendent for
Instructional Services

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION
PRINCIPALS

District	School Code No.	School	Location	Principal
1	121	Belmont	41st & Brown Streets	Harold R. Kurtz
	142	M. Washington	44th & Aspen Streets	Harold Trawick
	147	Locke	46th & Haverford Ave.	James E. Barksdale
	141	Rhoads	50th & Parrish Sts.	Robert L. Chapman(Dr.)
2	238	Meade	18th & Oxford Sts.	Mark Levin
	225	Carver	17th & Norris Sts.	Albert K. Schaaf
	242	Reynolds	24th & Jefferson Sts.	Phyllis Henderson
3	326	Hawthorne	12th & Fitzwater Sts.	Edythe Alfred
	341	Southwark	9th & Mifflin Sts.	Joseph P. Callan
	342	Spring Garden	12th & Ogden Sts.	Marilyn Meltzer
	347	M.C. Wister	8th & Parrish Sts.	Alice T. Jennings
	330	Kearny	6th & Fairmount Ave.	James P. Kane
4	427	Dick	25th & Diamond Sts.	Joseph E. Jefferson
	440	M.H. Stanton	16th & Cumberland Sts.	George A. Weiss
	423	Blankenburg	Girard Ave. at 46th St.	Barbara Foxworth
	441	Stokley	32nd & Berks Streets	James E. Washington
	447	R.R. Wright	28th & Dauphin Streets	Alvin Kressman
5	529	Ferguson	7th & Norris Streets	Sadie S. Mitchell
	533	Hunter	Mascher & Dauphin Sts.	Seymour C. Friend
	535	McKinley	Orkney & Diamond Sts.	Jose Vasquez
	542	Welsh	4th & York Streets	Joseph T. Doyle
	523	Hartranft	8th & Cumberland Sts.	John H. Diamond
	537	Moffet	Howard & Oxford Sts.	Irving Yudkin
6	642	East Falls	Merrick Rd. & Creswell	Ida Peterson
	633	Pastorius	Chelten & Sprague	Hytolia R. James(Dr.)
	647	J.B. Kelly	Pulaski & Hansberry	William Seiberlich
7	751	Bethune	Old York Rd. & Ontario	Elaine R. Gardner
	742	Smedley	Bridge & Mulberry	Joseph A. Vecchione
	744	Taylor	Randolph & Erie	Martin Eilberg

PRIMARY SKILLS PROGRAM
PRINCIPALS

District	School Code No.	School	Location	Principal
1	126	Comegys	51st & Greenway	John Grelis
	132	Holmes	55th & Chestnut	Seymour Kurtz
2	228	F. Douglass	22nd & Norris	Joseph W. Robinson
	239	Morris	26th & Thompson	Donald S. Harris
3	327	Jackson	12th & Federal	Julia W. Moore
	328	Jefferson	4th & George	Oscar W. Gibbs
	335	Meredith	5th & Fitzwater	Angelo Branca
4	422	Blaine	30th & Berks Sts.	Christine H. Lindsey
	430	Heston	54th & Lancaster Ave.	Richard Phipps
5	528	Fairhill	6th & Somerset	Rubye McLaughlin
	541	Sheppard	Howard & Cambria	Joan M. Heuges
6	644	Lingelbach	Wayne Ave. & Johnson	Allen Smallwood
	639	Steel	Wayne Ave. & Bristol	Edward R. Braxton
7	729	Stearne	Hedge & Unity	Zeldin B. Weisbein
	745	Webster	Frankford Ave. & Ontario St.	Joseph Levin
8	822	Crispin	Rhawn & Ditman Sts.	Henry M. Carroll
	824	Disston	Knorr & Cottage	Frank W. Hauser, Jr.

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION PROGRAM
RESOURCE TEACHERS

Resource Teacher	School	Option
DISTRICT 1		
Barbara Moore	Locke	1
	Rhoads	4
Beatrice Dent	Belmont	2
	Washington, M.	2
DISTRICT 2		
Larry Newman	Meade	1
Elizabeth Trulear	Reynolds	2
	Carver	4
DISTRICT 3		
Annie Johnson	Hawthorne	1
	Southwark	1
	Spring Garden	1
	Wister, M.C.	1
Floyda Marcus (D.L.A.)	Kearny	1
DISTRICT		
Bernice Berry Campbell	Dick	1
	Stanton	1
Helen Romans	Blankenburg	1
	Wright, R.R.	1
DISTRICT 5		
Marjorie Newman	Hartranft	1
	Moffet	2
Linda Lilly	Ferguson	5
	Hunter	5
	McKinley	5
	Welsh	5
DISTRICT 6		
Thomas Haley	Pastorius	4
Eileen Brown	East Falls	4
	Kelly, J.B.	4
DISTRICT 7		
Gwendolyn Sebastian	Bethune	1
Arlene Robin	Smedley	4
	Taylor	1

PRIMARY SKILLS PROGRAM
RESOURCE TEACHERS

Resource Teacher	School	Option
DISTRICT 1		
Deana Glickstein	Comegys	1
	Holmes	4
DISTRICT 2		
Trina Russell	Douglass	4
	Morris	4
DISTRICT 3		
Constance Palmer	Jackson	1
	Jefferson	1
	Meredith	1
DISTRICT 4		
Shirley Adams	Blaine	1
	Heston	1
DISTRICT 5		
Joan Hall	Fairhill	4
	Sheppard	4
DISTRICT 6		
Julia Reid	Lingelbach	4
	Steel	4
DISTRICT 7		
Deborah Seay	Stearne	1
	Webster	4
DISTRICT 8		
Marilyn Miller	Crispin	4
	Disston	4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Pre-Program Data

Background Characteristics 3

Pre-Program Input 4

Pre-Post Training 5

Expansion Program Survey

Background Characteristics 7

Educational Ideals 8

Academic Areas 10

Staff Development 10

Pre-School Experience 11

Parent Involvement 12

Program Impact 12

Continuation of Expansion Program 12

Pre-Post Expansion Program Comparisons 13

Original Follow Through and Expansion Program Comparisons 13

Summary 16

Appendices A and B

ABSTRACT

Prior to implementation of the Expansion program in first and second grades, training results indicated that 95% of the teachers and aides were clear about the specifics of the option they were expected to implement, and enthusiastic about their prospective involvement in the program. Staff knowledge and involvement in program development has been shown to provide and excellent basis for successful program implementation

After one year of program operations, 64% of the teachers across the program (K and 1) continued to express enthusiasm, and rated their respective options as effective in helping pupils' personal, social and academic development. Option II[1] teachers, however, tended to view their option's approach as ineffective and were less enthusiastic. This particular option presents a combination of teaching strategies and is often difficult to implement. Across options, principals, resource teachers, aides and parent scholars tended to view the Expansion Program even more positively than did classroom teachers.

Classroom teachers' rating indicate that Reading (81%), Arithmetic (72%), Handwriting (67%), and Oral Expression (66%) were considered to be the most effective academic areas. A parallel survey suggests that Creative Activities receive more attention in the Original Follow Through Program than in the Expansion Program.

Staff development was rated "effective" to "somewhat effective" by the majority in each category of respondents; and aides and parent scholars were considered effective.

[1]A Behavior Analysis/Bank Street combination

Indications of the impact of the program were found in the larger percentage of respondents who reported increased interest in individualized instruction, reaching the home, furthering their own education, and opting for program continuance.

This report provides perceptions of program impact. The objective, test-data based sources of information on program impact are contained in other reports. Summaries from these latter data show that of the 46 schools, 42 in kindergarten reading, 34 in kindergarten math, 26 in first grade reading, and 26 in first grade math, had more than 50% of their pupils scoring above the 50th percentile in 1975-1976.

INTRODUCTION

The Follow Through Expansion Program involves 46 schools in all eight districts. Twenty-nine schools funded under Title I constitute the "Expansion" Schools, while 17 schools funded from operating budget were designated as "Primary Skills" Program Schools. The program was instituted at the kindergarten level in March, 1975, at the first grade level in September, 1975, and in second grade the following year. Five model options were proposed for implementation on the basis of previous evaluation findings regarding the original Follow Through Program in Philadelphia. Of these, four were selected by the participating schools: Option 1: a local adaptation of the Behavior Analysis model (BA-A); Option 2: a Behavior Analysis/Bank Street combination (BA/BS-A); Option 3: a Behavior Analysis/Bilingual combination available but not selected by any of the participating schools (BA/BI-A); Option 4: a local adaptation of the Bank Street model (BS-A); and Option 5: a Bank Street/Bilingual combination (BS/BI-A).

Evaluation Goals:

In an effort to collect baseline information on principals, teachers and aides in the 46 expansion program schools, the evaluation staff developed questionnaires (see Appendix B) which were completed by all concerned at the beginning of the program (March, 1975). These data are included in an earlier report[1] and will be discussed in the comparison section of this report.

[1] Follow Through Expansion: Pre-program Data, 1975 #7642

The present report focuses on:

(1) pre-program data collected in the Summer, 1975 for first grade teachers; in the Summer, 1976 for second grade teachers, and in the Fall, 1976 for second grade aides.

(2) a survey conducted in the Spring, 1976 of the total program assessing program personnel's perceptions towards the Expansion Program after one year of program operation.

I. PRE-PROGRAM DATA

Prior to the implementation of the Expansion Program in first grade, training was conducted for first grade teachers in the Summer of 1975. Eighty-four (84) teachers completed pre-training questionnaires and 82 returned post-training questionnaires. Again in the Summer of 1976, prior to the implementation of the program in second grade, training was conducted for second grade teachers. Sixty-nine (69) pre-questionnaires and 73 post-questionnaires were returned. Second grade aides received initial training in the Fall, 1976, and 96 questionnaires were returned.

A) Background Characteristics

1) Teachers: (Table I)

Among the first grade teachers[1], 98% are female and 50% are between the ages of 30-50. The majority (71%) have a bachelor's degree, and 25% have a Master's degree. Second grade teachers are also predominantly female (99%), and 45% are under 30 years of age. Fifty-eight percent (58%) have a Bachelor's degree and 40% a Master's degree or higher. Sixty one percent (61%) of the first grade teachers, and 72% of the second grade teachers had five or more years of teaching experience at their particular expansion school. The majority also indicated that they had recently taught in more traditional classrooms.

[1] There were no responses from Option II first grade teachers.

ii) Aides: (Table 2)

The majority of second grade aides are female (94%) and, when compared with the first and second grade teachers, a larger percentage (18%) are over the age of 50. Most (70%) have completed or gone beyond high school and 43% have more than five years of classroom experience. The majority (80%) indicated that they had previously worked in second grade classrooms, but only 34% had previous Follow Through experience. Ninety-four percent (94%) also indicated that they had worked in a more traditional classroom setting. Only 32% of the aides lived in the immediate community of the school. This is because many existing aides in the school system were transferred due to contractual requirements.

B) Pre-program Input

1) Teachers: (Tables 3 and 4)

The majority of teachers indicated that they were informed about the program by the school principal in faculty meetings; approximately 40% reacted positively to the announcement, but the majority indicated that they had no voice in the decision to accept the Follow Through Expansion Program in their school or a choice in the model to be implemented. This is because the school's percentage of low income children and number of children with reading scores below the 16th percentile, were two of the criteria for selecting schools for the Expansion Program.

When asked what steps they had taken to prepare themselves for the Expansion Program, more than 50% of first and second grade teachers either did not respond to this question or indicated that they had done nothing to prepare themselves. Similarly, when asked how closely the model option was related to their teacher training,

49% of first grade teachers and 39% of the second grade teachers gave a positive response indicating some familiarity with the model specifics. Of those who did respond, Option IV (BS-A) first grade teachers (50%) and Option I (BA-A) second grade teachers (69%) indicated that their option was related to their beliefs about how children learn.

ii) Aides:

Information of a similar nature was not collected.

C) Pre-post Training

i) Teachers: (Tables 3 and 4)

Prior to training, 69% of the first and second grade teachers did not know whether they preferred the model they were to work with, or did not respond to the question. Both groups indicated a lack of clarity about the specifics of the model they were expected to implement (a mean score of 4.5 on a five point rating scale), but apparently were enthusiastic about working in their respective models. This was particularly true in the case of Option I (BA-A) second grade teachers.

Post training results indicated that both first and second grade teachers were much clearer about model specifics (mean ratings of 2.6 and 2.4 respectively) and exhibited a higher degree of enthusiasm (2.3 and 2.0 respectively) as a result of training. Both groups also rated their respective training sessions as effective (See Tables 3A and 4A).

ii. Aides: (Table 2)

No pre-training questionnaires were distributed, but post-training ratings indicated that the majority (95%) of second grade aides were enthusiastic about working in their particular model option, and clear about the specifics of the model they were expected to implement.

II. EXPANSION PROGRAM SURVEY, SPRING, 1976

In the spring of 1976, questionnaires were sent to Expansion Program principals, resource teachers, and instructional personnel (kindergarten and first grade) in order to assess program personnel's perceptions of the program after one year of program operations (see Table 5).

1. BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Principals (Table 6)

41/46 Expansion Program principals returned completed questionnaires. The majority (73%) are males between the ages of 35-50, and only 29% have less than 10 years of teaching experience. Most (58%) have been at their particular expansion school from 1 to 5 years, and 63% have over 6 years of experience as a principal.

Resource Teachers and Teachers (Tables 7 and 8)

Fifteen resource teachers[1] and 240 classroom teachers (kindergarten and first grade) returned completed questionnaires. Background information indicates that both groups are predominantly females under the age of 50. Whereas the majority of resource teachers hold the Masters' degree, only 38% of the classroom teachers hold graduate degrees. All resource teachers and 51% of the teachers' group have more than five years of teaching experience, but, while 66% of the resource teachers have over ten years of experience, only 30% of the teachers have this amount of experience. Sixty-six percent of the teachers have been at their particular expansion school for at least two years.

[1]There was no response from the Option V resource teachers.

Classroom Aides and Parent Scholars (Tables 9 and 10)

Two hundred and twenty (220) aides and 193 parent scholars returned completed questionnaires. The overwhelming majority are female. While 52% of the parent scholars are under the age of 30, 73% of the aides are over this age. In terms of educational experience, 90% of the aides and 66% of the parent scholars have completed 12th grade. The majority of aides (66%) and parent scholars (95%) live in the immediate community of the school.

2. EDUCATIONAL IDEALS (Tables 11-14)

In general, Expansion Program principals indicated that they were satisfied with the instructional option in their school. Forty-six percent (46%) felt that their particular option was related to their teacher training experience, and 76% felt it was closely related to their beliefs about how children learn. Sixty-eight percent (68%) indicated that their instructional option was effective in helping a child (1) think for himself, (2) learn to relate to his age group (80%), and (3) view school as a positive experience (90%). (See Appendix B, Table I).

The majority of resource teachers (13/17) and classroom teachers (64%) expressed enthusiasm toward working in their particular instructional option, and considered it to be related to their beliefs about how children learn (14/17 and 62% respectively). Most also rated their option as effective in helping a child (1) think for himself (9/17 and 59% respectively); (2) relate to his age group (10/17 and 63% respectively); and (3) view school as a positive experience (11/17 and 63% respectively). (Also see Appendix B, Tables 2 and 3).

A comparison was also made between Option I (BA-A) (N=116) and Option IV (BS-A) (N=91) teachers, who constituted 86% of the teaching group. Although both groups were equally enthusiastic about working in their instructional option (66% and 68% respectively), Option I (BA-A) teachers tended to be clearer about the specifics of their instructional option than Option IV (BS-A) teachers (75% and 64% respectively). On the other hand, Option IV (BS-A) teachers found their option more closely related to their beliefs about how children learn than did Option I (BA-A) teachers (78% and 62% respectively). Similarly, a larger percentage of Option IV teachers rated their option as effective in helping a child think for himself (70% as compared with 53%) and relate to his age group (76% as compared with 58%). Both groups, however, indicated that their respective options were equally effective in helping a child view school as a positive experience (78% as compared with 74%).

In interpreting Option II (BA/BS-A) and Option V (BS/BI-A) teacher responses, caution is needed since the N's are small, but it is notable that only 4/16 Option II (BA/BS-A) teachers indicated that they were clear about the specifics of their instructional option and that it was related to their beliefs about how children learn.

As a group, aides and parent scholars expressed an even higher degree of enthusiasm than teachers toward working in their instructional option (83% and 89% respectively). Similarly, a higher percentage of aides (83%) and parent scholars (73%) rated their option as effective in helping a child think for himself; relate to his age group (79% and 76% respectively); and view school as a positive experience (77% and 72% respectively). (See Appendix B, Tables 4 and 5).

3. ACADEMIC AREAS (Tables 11-14)

With the exception of Option II (BA/BS-A) teachers, most of whom seem to view their option as ineffective in the academic areas, the majority in each group considered their respective option as having an effective approach to Reading, Arithmetic, Handwriting and Oral Expression. Overall the approach to Creative Activities was considered less effective, particularly in Option I (BA-A) where emphasis is on the basic skills. With the exception of Option IV (BS-A) teachers and resource teachers, much lower ratings were assigned to Social Studies, Science, and Written Expression, and particularly low effectiveness ratings were assigned to these areas by Option I (BA-A) resource teachers and classroom teachers.

4. STAFF DEVELOPMENT (Tables 11-14)

Eighty-two percent (82%) of the principals felt that the Expansion Program had had a positive effect on staff development at their school. The majority of resource teachers indicated that they received staff development weekly. While Option I (BA-A) resource teachers tended to rate the staff development they received as very effective, Option II (BA/BS-A) resource teachers rated it as not at all effective.

Fifty-three percent (53%) of the classroom teacher indicated that they received staff development from once a week to once a month, and 37% rated the staff development they received as very effective, while 37% rated it as somewhat effective. Option II (BA/BS-A) teachers tended to rate the staff development they received as ineffective, as did Option II (BA/BS-A) resource teachers. (Also see Appendix B, Tables 1-3).

Seventy-one percent (71%) of the aides indicated that they received staff development from once a week to once a month, and 54% rated it as very effective. Again, Option II (BA/BS-A) aides tended to rate the staff

development they received as less effective than aides in the other three options.

Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the parent scholars indicated that they received special training in classroom instruction from once a week to once a month, and 76% found it to be very effective.

5. PRE-SCHOOL EXPERIENCE (Appendix B, Table 1-3)

As might be expected, 83% of the principals, almost all of the resource teachers and 84% of the classroom teachers considered pre-school experience important for a child's success in their respective options.

6. PARENT INVOLVEMENT (Appendix B, Tables 1-3)

In response to questions asking about the effectiveness of aides, parent scholars and parent volunteers, the majority of principals considered aides and parent scholars effective, but 9/41 principals did not rate parent volunteers--possibly because they were not being utilized in the classroom. Of those principals who did provide effectiveness ratings, 20/32 considered volunteers to be effective. A similar pattern holds true for resource teachers where all 15 considered aides as very effective, 10 considered parent scholars as effective, but more than half (N=8) provided no rating for parent volunteers. The majority of classroom teachers (81%) considered aides effective, and 59% considered parent scholars effective, particularly in Option I (BA-A) (74%) where the parent scholar is an integral part of the curriculum plan. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of the teachers did not rate parent volunteers.

Aides and parent scholars were asked how they were being utilized in the classroom. The overwhelming majority of aides indicated that they instructed small groups regularly, but Option IV (BS-A) and V (BS/BI-A) aides tended to instruct individual children more often than Option I

(BA-A) and II (BA/BS-A) aides. Similarly, the majority of parent scholars indicated that they regularly instructed small groups, with the exception of Option V (BS/BI-A) parent scholars, where the majority (10/15) do so occasionally, but apparently spend more of their time instructing individual children. (See Tables 13 and 14).

7. PROGRAM IMPACT (Appendix B, Tables 1-5)

After one year of program operation , the majority of principals indicated that the Expansion Program had had a positive effect on achievement (68%); parent participation (75%); staff development (83%); and on motivating instructional personnel (78%). The majority in each of the groups also indicated that working in the program had clarified their ideas of what education should do for the child, and increased their interest in individualized instruction, as well as in reaching the home. A comparison between options suggests that Option IV (BS-A) has been particularly helpful to principals, teachers and aides in clarifying their ideas of what education should do for the child.

As a result of the Expansion Program, 80% of the aides and 83% of the parent scholars indicated that they were interested in furthering their education.

8. CONTINUATION OF EXPANSION PROGRAM (Appendix B, Tables 2-5)

When asked if they would like to see the program continued, all of the resource teachers, 78% of the classroom teachers, 94% of the aides and 95% of the parent scholars answered in the affirmative.

Among the teachers, Option IV and V teachers yielded the highest percentage of "yes" responses while Option II (BA/BS-A) teachers yielded the lowest percentage. The principals were not asked if they wanted the program continued, but based on the frequency of positive responses regarding the program and it implementation, it can be inferred that the majority of the principals are interested in the continuation of the Expansion Program. (See Tables 11 and 12).

9. PRE-POST EXPANSION PROGRAM COMPARISONS

In comparing pre-program data collected in 1975 with data collected in 1976 after one year of program operations, it appears that the expectations of the majority of principals have been realized, i.e., they view the program as having had a positive effect on pupil achievement, parent participation, staff development, and on the motivation of instructional personnel.

Similarly, the majority of each group continue to view the program positively, with the exception of Option II (BA/BS-A) respondents who, appear to be unclear about the specifics of the option they are attempting to implement, generally view the approach to be ineffective, and are losing their enthusiasm.

10. ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH AND EXPANSION PROGRAM COMPARISONS

A similar survey was conducted in 1976 in the original Follow Through program. Comparison data indicate that in both the original Follow Through and Expansion programs, most principals, staff developers (resource teachers), classroom teachers, aides and parents view their respective model or option as effective in helping pupils' personal and social development, with the

exception of teachers from Option II (BA/BS-A) in the Expansion Program, and Florida Parent teachers in the original program.

According to teachers in the original program, the most effective academic areas are Oral Expression (77%), Reading (72%), Arithmetic (69%) and Creative Activities (64%). In the Expansion Program, the most effective areas are Reading (81%), Arithmetic (72%), Handwriting (67%) and Oral Expression (66%). However, most Option II teachers in the Expansion Program consistently assigned low effectiveness ratings to these and other academic areas.

The effectiveness of aides, parent scholars and parent volunteers was measured. Aides, in particular, were considered effective by the majority of teachers in both programs (O=89%; E=81%). Parent scholars were considered effective by 50% (O) and 59% (E) of the teachers respectively. Only 32% of the original program teachers considered parent volunteers as effective, and 57% of the Expansion Program teachers provided no rating, suggesting that they had had no direct experience with parent volunteers as yet.

Responses from aides in both programs indicate that the overwhelming majority instruct small groups regularly, with more instruction of individual children occuring in the Bank Street, Florida Parent and Parent Implemented models, as well as Option I (BS-A) and V (BS/BI-A) in the Expansion Program.

Indications of the impact of both programs were found in the large percentage of program respondents in each group who reported increased interest in individualized instruction, reaching the home, furthering their own education, and opting for the programs' continuance. Option II (BA/BS-A)

teachers were the least enthusiastic regarding these dimensions, with slightly more than half responding positively. Similarly, only 50% of the Florida Parent teachers opted for program continuance.

SUMMARY

Pre-post training data for first and second grade teachers and second grade aides indicate that training was considered effective and that all concerned were much clearer about the specifics of the option they were expected to implement. Ninety-five percent of the respondents indicated a higher degree of enthusiasm as a result of training.

Survey data after one year of program operation indicate that 64% of all classroom teachers in the program (kindergarten and first grade) continued to express enthusiasm towards working in their particular instruction option, and generally rated their option as effective in helping pupils' personal, social and academic development. Option II (BA/BS-A) teachers represent a notable exception in that most tended to view their options' approach as ineffective. Option II (BA/BS-A), represents a combination of teaching strategies, and is often difficult for pervasive implementation.

Across options, teachers' ratings suggest that the most effective academic areas are Reading (81%), Arithmetic (72%), Handwriting (67%), and Oral Expression (66%). A similar survey conducted in the original Follow Through Program indicates that Creative Activities (64%) probably receive more attention there than in the Expansion Program. Handwriting receives more attention in the Expansion Program.

Principals, resource teachers, aides and parent scholars tended to view the Expansion Program even more positively than classroom teachers. This trend has also been consistently found in surveys of the original Follow Through Program.

Staff development was considered to be effective to somewhat effective by 74% of the teachers, 86% of the aides and 90% of the parent scholars. Option II (BA/BS-A) resource teachers, teachers and aides tended to rate the staff development they received as less effective than those in other options.

Classroom aides were rated effective by a large majority of principals, resource teachers, and classroom teachers as was the case in the original program survey, and parent scholars were considered effective by a smaller majority. In both programs parent volunteers were rated less favorably, with 57% of the Expansion program teachers providing no rating. The majority of aides and parent scholars indicated that they regularly instructed small groups.

Indications of the impact of both the Expansion and the original program were found in the large percentage of respondents who reported increased interest in individualized intruction, reaching the home, furthering their own education, and opting for program continuance.

APPENDIX A

Tables 1-14

Table 1
Pre Program Data

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS[1]
(1st Grade, 1975 and 2nd Grade, 1976)
TEACHERS

Categories And Responses	1st GRADE[2] Option I N=44		Option IV N=34		Option V N=6		Total Respondents N=84		2nd GRADE Option I N=35		Option II N=5		Option IV N=20		Option V N=9		Total Respondents N=69	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 SEX																		
MALE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	1
FEMALE	44	100	32	94	6	100	82	98	35	100	5	100	19	95	9	100	68	99
2 AGE																		
Under 30	12	27	14	41	2	33	28	33	18	51	2	40	7	35	4	44	31	45
30-50	28	64	11	32	3	50	42	50	14	40	3	60	11	55	4	44	32	46
Over 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
3 Highest Lev. School Comp.																		
BA	30	68	25	74	5	83	60	71	22	63	2	40	12	60	4	44	40	58
MA	14	32	7	21	0	0	21	25	10	28	2	40	6	30	3	33	21	30
MA+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	20	2	10	2	22	7	10
4A Yrs. Tching Experience[3]																		
> FIVE	27	61	21	62	3	50	51	61	26	74	4	80	14	70	6	66	50	72
> TEN	24	55	14	41	2	33	40	48	9	26	1	20	6	30	3	33	19	27
4B Grades Taught[3]																		
Kg.	4	19	4	12	0	0	8	10	2	16	3	60	2	10	1	11	5	7
1st	42	95	34	100	6	100	82	98	7	20	4	80	6	30	1	11	17	25
2nd	19	43	20	59	2	33	41	49	33	94	0	0	17	85	8	88	62	90
5 Yrs. at Given School																		
> FIVE	25	57	10	29	2	33	37	31	29	82	4	80	17	85	6	66	56	81
> TEN	16	36	2	6	0	0	18	15	6	17	1	20	3	15	3	33	13	19

1 Due to rounding, percentage may not equal 100. For brevity, the No Response category was not included.
2 No Option II Respondents.
3. The >5 group has been included in the >10 group where appropriate, this accounts for the inflated total percentage.

Table 2
Percentage Distribution of
Classroom Aide Program Questionnaire Data[1]

Question Number	Question	Option I N=49	Option II N=9	Option IV N=29	Option V N=9	Total Follow Through N=96
1	Sex					
	Male	2	0	7	11	4
	Female	98	100	89	77	94
2	Age					
	Under 30	16	11	21	22	18
	30-50	54	88	59	66	63
	Over 50	22	0	17	11	18
3	Level of Schooling					
	9th & below	20	0	24	44	22
	10th & 11th	6	0	10	0	6
	12th Grade	37	88	28	33	38
	Beyond 12th	35	11	38	22	32
4	Live in Immediate Community					
	Yes	31	44	31	33	32
	No	69	55	69	66	68
5	Years as Classroom Aide					
	<5=	44	22	62	77	51
	<10=	47	77	31	22	43
	10+=	6	0	7	0	5
	Grades Taught					
	Kindergarten[2]	10	11	1	22	13
	1st	63	88	48	44	50
	2nd	75	88	79	99	80
	3rd	63	88	38	44	56
	Other	99	100	72	77	97
7	Have you worked in a Follow Through classroom before?					
	Yes	31	11	52	22	34
	No	69	88	45	66	63
8	If Yes, in which Model or Option					
	N. R.*	69	88	45	66	63
9	Which Option will you be Working in?	100	88	100	100	—

Q#	Question	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$
10	Clarity of Model Specifics										
	1 2 3 4 5	100	1.9	100	2.3	96	2.2	88	1.9	95	2.0
11	Enthusiasm about Working in Model										
	1 2 3 4 5	100	1.6	100	1.6	96	2.0	88	2.3	95	1.9
12	Type of Classroom:										
	Traditional Open										
	1 2 3 4 5	100	2.0	100	1.7	89	3.1	88	2.5	94	2.3

* N. R. - No Response

1 Due to either no response to the question, or rounding, percentages may not add to 100.
2 Overlapping responses account for the inflated total percentage.

Table 3
Percentage Distribution of
Pre-Program Questionnaire Data[1]
1st Grade Teachers[2]

Question Number	Question	Option I N=44	Option IV N=34	Option V N=6	Total Follow Through N=84
1	Sex - Female	100	94	100	98
2	Age - Under 30	27	41	33	33
	30-50	64	32	50	50
3	Highest Level Schooling - BA	68	74	83	71
	MA	32	21	0	25
4A	Years of Teaching Experience[3]				
	(>5)	61	62	50	61
	(>10)	55	41	33	48
4B	Grades Taught During That Time				
	1st	95	100	100	98
	2nd	43	59	33	49
	Other	9	12	0	10
5	Years at Follow Through School				
	(>5)	57	29	33	50
	(>10)	36	6	0	21
6	Data Not Available				
7	Informed Through:				
	Principal	57	62	67	60
	Personnel Flyer	23	32	0	26
8	Informed in:				
	Faculty Meeting	55	59	50	56
	Other	20	18	33	18
9	Reaction to Information (+)	30	56	83	44
	(-)	20	9	0	14
10A	Faculty Voice in Decision to Accept Follow Through				
	Yes	5	0	0	2
	No	87	82	100	87
10B	Faculty Voice in Choice of Model				
	Yes	0	12	0	5
	No	75	65	83	71
11	Model To be Used	100	100	100	-
12	Is This Model Preferred- Yes	9	44	DK/NR*	23
	No	16	0		8

1 Due to either no response to the questioning or rounding, percentages may not add to 100.
2 There was No Response from Option 2 teachers.
3 Because of missing data, it was assumed that the >5 group has been included in the >10 group, thus accounting for the inflated total percentage.
* Did Not Know, or No Response

Table 3 (cont'd)
Pre-Program Questionnaire Data[1]
1st Grade Teachers[2]

Question Number	Question	Option I N=44		Option IV N=34		Option V N=6		Total Follow Through N=84	
		%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$
13	Clarity About Option + − 1 2 3 4 5	95	4.7	94	4.2	100	5.0	95	4.5
14	Enthusiasm About Option + − 1 2 3 4 5	86	3.0	59	2.7	50	1.3	65	2.5
15	Model and Teacher Training Relationship + − 1 2 3 4 5	45	3.8	59	1.3	17	2.0	49	3.4
16	Model and Beliefs about Learning + − 1 2 3 4 5	43	3.1	50	2.3	17	1.0	44	2.6
17	Type of Classroom Traditional Open 1 2 3 4 5	100	1.9	82	2.0	100	2.7	93	2.0
18	Prepared For New Program by:								
	Reading	5		18		33		12	
	Observations	23		18		17		20	
	Discussions	14		12		0		12	
	Did Nothing	34		44		17		37	

1 Due to either no response to the questioning or rounding, percentages may not add to 100.

2 There was No Response from Option 2 teachers.

Table 3A
Post-Training Questionnaire Data Summary

1st Grade Teachers

Question Number	Question	Option I N=39		Option IV N=38		Option V N=5		Total Follow Through N=82	
		%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$
2	Clarity About Option + - 1 2 3 4 5	87	2.5	100	2.7	100	2.2	94	2.6
3	Enthusiasm About Option + - 1 2 3 4 5	97	2.7	100	2.1	100	1.2	99	2.3
4	Model and Beliefs about Learning + - 1 2 3 4 5	100	2.4	100	1.7	100	1.4	100	2.0
5	Effectiveness of Training + - 1 2 3 4 5	100	2.7	100	2.7	100	1.4	100	2.6

Table 4
Percentage Distribution of
Pre-Program Questionnaire Data[1]
2nd Grade Teachers

Question Number	Question	Option I N=35	Option II N=5	Option IV N=20	Option V N=9	Total Follow Through N=69
1	Sex					
	Male	0	0	1	0	1
	Female	100	100	99	100	99
2	Age					
	Under 30	51	40	35	44	45
	30-50	40	60	55	44	46
	Over 50	9	0	5	11	7
3	Highest Level of Schooling					
	BA	63	40	60	44	58
	MA	29	40	30	33	30
	MA+	6	20	10	22	10
4a	Years of Teaching Experience					
	>5	74	80	70	66	72
	>10	26	20	30	33	27
4b	Grades Taught During That Time[2]					
	Kindergarten	6	0	10	11	7
	1st	20	60	30	11	25
	2nd	94	80	85	88	90
	Other	83	100	80	77	87
5	Years at Follow Through School					
	>5	83	80	85	66	81
	>10	17	20	15	33	19
6	Heard About Follow Through					
	1974	31	60	5	0	23
	1975	26	20	25	55	30
	1976	20	0	20	11	16
7	Informed By:					
	Principal	29	40	65	22	39
	Personnel Office	7	0	5	22	16
	Other	43	60	30	44	40
8	Informed By:					
	Principal	51	80	70	44	58
	Conference	14	0	15	0	12
	Memo	11	0	15	11	13
	Other	20	20	0	33	16
9	Reaction to Information					
	+	54	60	40	33	43
	-	14	40	25	22	19
	DK/NR*	8	0	15	33	13
10a	Faculty Voice in Decision to Accept Follow Through					
	Yes	11	0	10	11	10
	No	74	80	85	77	78
	DK/NR*	14	20	5	12	12

[1] Due to either no response to the question, or rounding, percentages may not add to 100.
* DK/NR Did Not Know, or No Response.
[2] Overlapping responses account for the inflated total percentage.

Table 4 (cont'd)
Percentage Distribution of
Pre-Program Questionnaire Data[1]
2nd Grade Teachers

Question Number	Question	Option I N=35	Option II N=5	Option IV N=20	Option V N=9	Total Follow Through N=69
10b	Faculty Voice in Choice of Model					
	Yes	9	0	5	0	6
	No	63	60	70	88	70
	DK/NR*	26	40	25	12	24
11	Model	100	100	100	100	-
12	Is This Model Preferred					
	Yes	35	0	30	33	24
	No	9	0	5	11	6
	DK/NR*	56	100	65	56	69
		% $\bar{x}$	% $\bar{x}$	% $\bar{x}$	% $\bar{x}$	% $\bar{x}$
13	Clarity About Option + - 1 2 3 4 5	100 3.7	100 5.0	100 4.6	88 4.5	97 4.4
14	Enthusiasm About Option + - 1 2 3 4 5	94 1.7	100 2.6	95 3.0	88 3.5	96 2.7
15	Model and Teacher Training Relationship + - 1 2 3 4 5	66 1.5	No Response	40 3.3	50 3.5	39 2.1
16	Model and Beliefs on Learning + - 1 2 3 4 5	69 1.2	No Response	35 2.5	50 3.2	38 1.7
17	Type of Classroom Traditional Open 1 2 3 4 5	97 1.7	80 2.0	90 1.7	100 3.1	66 2.2
18	Prepared for Follow Through By:					
	Reading	6	0	0	0	3
	Observations	14	0	0	11	9
	Discussions	37	20	40	33	36
	Did Nothing	43	60	60	55	51

[1] Due to either no response to the question, or rounding, percentages may not add to 100.
* DK/NR Did Not Know, or No Response.

Table 4A
Summary of Post-Training Questionnaire Data
2nd Grade Teachers

Question Number	Question	Option I N=34		Option II N=7		Option IV N=22		Option V N=10		Total Follow Through N=73	
		%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$
2	Clarity About Option + - 1 2 3 4 5	100	2.0	100	2.1	86	2.7	100	2.5	97	2.4
3	Enthusiasm About Option + - 1 2 3 4 5	100	1.6	100	2.1	100	2.0	100	2.4	100	2.0
4	Model and Beliefs on Learning + - 1 2 3 4 5	100	2.0	100	2.5	95	1.9	100	1.6	99	2.0
5	Effectiveness of Training + - 1 2 3 4 5	100	1.4	100	2.1	100	1.9	100	1.3	100	1.7

Table 5

SURVEY RESPONDENTS 1975-76

Category	Follow Through Expansion			Primary Skills Program			Total Program		
	N	R[1]	%	N	R	%	N	R	%
Principals	29	25	86	17	16	94	46	41	89
Resource Teachers	13	See Note Four	See Note Four	8	See Note Four	See Note Four	21	15	71
Classroom Teachers (1st & 2nd)	195	153	78	105	87	82	300	240	80
Classroom Aides[2] (1st & 2nd)	195	144	74	105	76	72	300	220	73
Parent Scholars[3] (1st & 2nd)	177	121	68	93	72	77	270	193	71

1 Number of Respondents

2 Numbers based on one aide per teacher

3 Fourth Cycle Parent Scholars only; the above N is based on total number of Parent Scholars listed on fourth cycle direct expenditure reimbursement (DER) form.

4 Information not available since Resource Teachers work with a cluster of schools and particular program was not designated on questionnaire

Table 6

Background Characteristics[1]
Principals
Survey 1975-76

CATEGORIES AND RESPONSES	Option I N=22		Option II N=2		Option IV N=13		Option V N=4		Total Expansion Program N=41	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex										
Male	15	68	1	50	11	85	3	75	30	73
Female	6	27	1	50	2	15	1	25	10	24
No Response	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Age										
Under 35	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	25	3	7
35-50	14	63	1	50	7	54	3	75	25	61
Over 50	5	23	1	50	6	46	0	0	12	29
No Response	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Years as Principal at Particular School										
1-5	16	72	0	0	6	46	2	50	24	58
6-10	5	23	1	50	6	46	2	50	14	34
11-15	1	5	1	50	0	0	0	0	2	5
No Response	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	1	2
Years Experience as a Principal										
1-5	11	50	2	100	1	8	1	25	15	36
6-10	7	32	0	0	6	46	2	50	15	36
11-15	4	18	0	0	4	31	1	25	9	22
16-20	0	0	0	0	2	15	0	0	2	5
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years of Teaching Experience										
1-5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
6-10	3	13	1	50	5	38	2	50	11	27
11-15	8	36	1	50	4	31	1	25	14	34
16-20	4	18	0	0	3	23	1	25	8	19
Over 20	5	23	0	0	1	8	0	0	6	15
No Response	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2

[1]Due to rounding, percentages may not equal 100.

Table 7
Background Characteristics[1]
Program Resource Teachers[2]
Survey 1975-76[3]

Categories & Responses	Option I		Option II		Option IV		Total Expansion Program	
	N=11		N=2		N=8		N=15	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex								
Male	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	7
Female	10	91	2	100	8	100	14	93
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age								
Under 30	4	36	0	0	2	25	6	40
30-50	7	63	2	100	6	75	9	60
Over 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highest Level of School Completed								
BA	3	27	0	0	3	38	6	40
MA	5	45	2	100	3	38	6	40
MA+	3	27	0	0	0	0	3	20
No Response	0	0	0	0	2	25	0	0
Years of Teaching Experience								
0-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-10	5	45	0	0	0	0	5	33
Over 10	6	55	2	100	5	62	10	66
No Response	0	0	0	0	3	38	0	0
Time As An Expansion Program Resource Teacher								
0-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 Mos.-1 Year	6	55	0	0	0	0	6	40
1 Year-2 Years	5	45	1	50	5	62	9	60
No Response	0	0	1	50	3	38	0	0

1 No response from Option V resource teachers.
2 The two resource teachers for Option II are also resource teachers for Option IV. Two of the Option I resource teachers also are Option IV teachers. As they responded to information for each option, they are included in both columns.
3 Due to Rounding, percentages may not equal 100.

Table 8
Background Characteristics[1]
Classroom Teachers (Kindergarten and 1st Grade)
Survey 1975-76

CATEGORIES AND RESPONSES	Option I N=116		Option II N=16		Option IV N=91		Option V N=17		Total Expansion Program N=240	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex										
Male	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	1
Female	113	97	16	100	90	99	17	100	236	98
No Response	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
Age										
Under 30	47	40	5	31	32	35	7	41	91	38
30-50	56	48	8	50	48	53	8	47	120	50
Over 50	10	9	3	19	10	11	2	12	25	10
No Response	3	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	2
Highest Level of School Completed										
BA	74	64	12	75	53	58	10	59	149	62
MA	34	29	4	25	24	26	5	29	67	28
MA+	8	7	0	0	13	15	2	12	23	9
No Response	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	.4
Years of Teaching Experience										
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	2	1
Less 2	12	10	3	19	7	7	3	18	25	10
2-5	56	48	6	37	25	27	4	23	91	38
6-10	21	18	1	6	26	29	3	18	51	21
Over 10	27	23	6	37	32	35	6	35	71	30
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years Taught at Particular School										
0	5	4	0	0	3	3	1	6	9	4
Less 2	37	32	4	25	28	31	3	18	72	30
2-5	26	22	5	31	25	27	6	35	62	26
6-10	27	24	3	19	22	24	6	35	58	24
Over 10	21	18	4	25	13	14	1	6	39	16
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1] Due to rounding, percentages may not always add to 100.

Table 9

Background Characteristics[1]
Classroom Aides
Survey (1st and 2nd Grades, 1975-76)

CATEGORIES AND RESPONSES	Option I N=103		Option II N=17		Option IV N=82		Option V N=18		Total Expansion Program N=220	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex										
Male	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	6	5	2
Female	101	98	17	100	80	98	17	94	215	98
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age										
Under 30	33	32	5	29	15	18	5	28	58	26
30-50	63	61	6	35	58	71	11	61	138	63
Over 50	5	5	5	29	9	11	2	11	21	10
No Response	2	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	1
Highest Level of School Completed										
Elementary	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	.4
Ninth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tenth	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4	2
Eleventh	8	8	3	17	4	5	4	22	19	9
Twelfth	63	61	10	58	59	72	7	39	139	63
Beyond 12	29	28	3	17	18	22	5	28	55	25
No Response	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	.9
Live in School Community										
Yes	70	68	12	70	54	66	9	50	145	66
No	31	30	4	23	28	34	9	50	72	33
No Response	2	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	1
Years Experience As Aide										
0-2	31	30	2	12	41	50	5	28	79	36
3-5	13	13	7	41	10	12	3	17	33	15
6-7	21	20	2	12	12	15	5	28	40	18
8-10	23	22	1	6	4	5	1	6	29	13
Over 10	6	6	4	23	10	12	3	17	23	10
No Response	9	9	1	6	5	6	1	6	16	7

[1] Due to rounding, percentages may not always add to 100.

Table 10

Background Characteristics[1]
4th Cycle Parent Scholars (1st and 2nd Grade)
Survey 1975-76

CATEGORIES AND RESPONSES	Option I N=96		Option II N=16		Option IV N=66		Option V N=15		Total Expansion Program N=193	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sex										
Male	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	1
Female	93	97	14	87	64	96	14	93	185	96
No Response	1	1	2	13	1	2	1	7	5	3
Age										
Under 30	60	62	8	50	25	38	7	46	100	52
30-50	34	35	8	50	36	54	7	46	85	44
Over 50	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	3	1
No Response	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	7	5	3
Highest Level of School Completed										
Elementary	7	7	1	6	1	2	5	33	14	7
9	6	6	1	6	2	3	0	0	9	5
10	4	4	2	12	3	5	2	13	11	6
11	14	15	3	19	10	15	3	20	30	16
12	43	45	7	44	38	57	5	33	93	48
12 + 1	13	14	0	0	5	7	0	0	18	9
12 + 2	8	8	0	0	7	11	0	0	15	8
No Response	1	1	2	12	0	0	0	0	3	1
Live in Immediate Community										
Yes	91	95	14	87	66	100	13	87	184	95
No	5	5	2	13	0	0	2	13	9	5
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1] Due to rounding, percentages may not always add to 100.

Table 11
Effectiveness Ratings ("1" and "2")
On Program Dimensions

Principals	Option 1 N=22		Option 2 N=2		Option 4 N=13		Option 5 N=4	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option is closely related to teacher training background	12	54	1	50	5	39	1	25
Role in option is closely related to administrative experience	19	87	1	50	11	85	2	50
Option ideals are closely related to education and training experiences	16	74	2	100	6	46	2	50
Option is related to belief about how children learn	18	82	2	100	10	77	4	100
Option is effective for helping a child think for himself	16	74	2	100	10	77	1	25
Option is effective for helping a child relate to his age group	16	74	2	100	11	85	4	100
Option is effective for helping a child view school as a positive experience	20	91	2	100	11	85	4	100
Preschool experience is important for success in option	19	87	2	100	9	69	4	100
Option provides an effective approach to Reading	19	87	2	100	10	77	4	100
Option provides an effective approach to Arithmetic	20	91	2	100	8	62	3	75
Option provides an effective approach to Social Studies	14	64	1	50	9	69	2	50
Option provides an effective approach to Science	10	46	1	50	5	39	2	50
Option provides an effective approach to Handwriting Skills	19	87	2	100	8	62	2	50

Table 11 (cont'd)

Effectiveness Ratings ("1" and "2")
On Program Dimensions

Principals	Option 1 N=22		Option 2 N=2		Option 4 N=13		Option 5 N=4	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option provides an effective approach to Written Expression	12	54	2	100	8	62	2	50
Option provides an effective approach to Oral Expression	16	74	2	100	11	85	3	75
Option provides an effective approach to Creative Activities	14	64	1	50	10	77	4	100
Option has clarified ideas of what education should do for child	10	46	1	50	9	69	2	50
Option has increased interest in individualized instruction	16	74	1	50	8	62	2	50
Option has increased interest in reaching the home	13	59	0	0	10	77	2	50
Option has increased interest in teacher development	15	68	2	100	10	77	1	25
Effectiveness of full time aide	21	95	2	100	12	92	4	100
Effectiveness of Parent Volunteers	12	54	1	50	5	39	1	25
No Response	4	18	0	0	5	39	1	25
Effectiveness of Parent Scholars	19	87	1	50	10	77	2	50
Follow Through had a positive effect on Achievement	16	74	1	50	10	77	1	25
Follow Through had a positive effect on Parent participation	17	77	2	100	9	69	2	50
Follow Through had a positive effect on Staff Development	18	82	2	100	12	92	3	75
Follow Through had a positive effect on Motivation of Instructional Personnel	18	82	2	100	10	77	2	50

Table 12
Effectiveness Ratings ("1" and "2")
On Program Dimensions

Question / Teacher Response	Option 1 N=116		Option 2 N=16		Option 4 N=91		Option 5 N=17	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Years taught at particular school?								
(2) <2	42	36	4	25	31	34	4	24
(3) 2-5	26	22	5	31	25	27	6	35
(4) 5-10	27	23	3	19	22	24	6	35
(5) >10	21	18	4	25	13	14	1	6
How often do you receive staff development?								
(1) Once a week	26	22	4	25	33	36	2	12
(2) Every other week	14	12	2	12	8	9	1	6
(3) Once a month	28	24	9	56	11	12	13	76
(4) Other	40	34	0	0	30	33	0	0
Effectiveness of staff development								
Very Effective	39	34	2	12	40	44	7	41
Somewhat Effective	51	44	5	31	27	30	5	29
Not at all Effective	17	14	8	50	11	12	1	6
Effectiveness of full time aide	95	82	11	69	78	86	11	65
Effectiveness of Parent Volunteers	30	26	5	31	28	31	2	12
No Response	67	58	8	50	49	54	12	70
Effectiveness of Parent Scholars	85	74	9	56	55	60	8	47
Clear about option specifics	87	75	4	25	58	64	9	53
Enthusiastic about working in option	76	66	5	31	63	69	11	65
Option related to belief about how children learn	72	62	4	25	71	78	10	59
Effectiveness of option for helping a child think for himself	61	53	7	44	64	70	10	59
Effectiveness of option for helping a child relate to age group	67	58	7	44	69	76	10	59
Effectiveness of option for helping a child view school as a positive experience	85	74	8	50	71	78	12	70

Table 12 (cont'd)
Effectiveness Ratings ("1" and "2")
On Program Dimensions

Question Teacher Response	Option 1 N=116		Option 2 N=16		Option 4 N=91		Option 5 N=17	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Effective option approach to Reading	96	83	8	50	77	85	13	76
Effective option approach to Arithmetic	89	77	7	44	68	74	8	47
Effective option approach to Social Studies	45	39	7	44	59	65	11	65
Effective option approach to Science	32	28	6	37	51	56	5	29
Effection option approach to Handwriting	83	72	8	50	56	61	10	59
Effective option approach to Written Expression	41	35	6	37	52	57	5	29
Effective option approach to Oral Expression	66	57	9	56	69	76	13	76
Effective option approach to Creativ Activities	48	41	7	44	56	62	9	53
Option has clarified ideas of what education should do for the child	65	56	8	50	60	66	12	70
Option has increased interest in individualized instruction	94	81	10	62	76	84	14	82
Option has increased interest in reaching home	73	63	9	56	64	70	13	76
Preschool experience is important for success in option	98	84	12	75	81	89	11	65
Would like to see Expansion Program continued	87	75	9	56	77	85	15	88

Table 13
Effectiveness Ratings ("1" and "2")
On Program Dimensions

Aides	Option 1 N=103		Option 2 N=17		Option 4 N=82		Option 5 N=18	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
How often do you receive staff development?								
once a week	24	23	1	6	41	50	5	28
every other week	25	24	5	29	10	12	2	11
once a month	31	30	4	23	7	8	1	6
other	18	17	5	29	20	24	9	50
Effectiveness of staff development								
effective	61	60	3	18	46	56	10	55
somewhat	35	34	8	47	21	26	6	33
not at all	2	2	1	6	10	12	0	0
Clear about specifics on option	94	91	7	41	64	78	13	72
Enthusiastic about working in option	85	82	12	70	72	88	15	88
Option is effective for helping a child think for himself	85	82	13	76	73	89	14	78
Option is effective for helping a child learn to relate to his age group	83	80	9	53	68	83	15	83
Option is effective for helping a child view school as a positive experience	78	76	11	65	69	84	12	67
Option provides an effective approach to Reading	87	84	13	76	73	89	14	78
Option provides an effective approach to Arithmetic	88	85	13	76	64	78	15	83
Option provides an effective approach to Social Studies	50	48	6	35	56	68	8	44
Option provides an effective approach to Science	47	46	7	41	46	56	8	44

Table 13 (cont'd)
Effectiveness Ratings ("1" and "2")
on Program Dimensions

Aides	Option 1 N=103		Option 2 N=17		Option 4 N=82		Option 5 N=18	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option provides an effective approach to Handwriting Skills	79	77	12	70	65	79	14	78
Option provides an effective approach to Written Expression	58	56	11	65	48	58	13	72
Option provides an effective approach to Oral Expression	72	70	13	76	66	80	13	72
Option provides an effective approach to Creative Activities	71	69	12	70	62	76	14	78
Option has clarified ideas of what education should do for the child	93	90	14	82	79	96	17	94
Option has increased interest in school	93	90	15	88	78	95	17	94
Option has increased interest in reaching the home	78	76	10	59	72	88	16	89
Instruct whole class								
never	17	16	2	12	6	7	6	33
occasionally	70	68	13	76	68	83	10	55
regularly	6	6	0	0	6	7	1	6
Instruct small groups								
never	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
occasionally	2	2	0	0	5	6	2	11
regularly	98	95	17	100	77	94	16	89
Instruct individual children								
never	3	3	2	12	1	1	1	6
occasionally	37	36	10	59	19	23	4	22
regularly	52	50	5	29	62	76	13	72
Would like to see Expansion Program continued	98	95	15	88	78	95	16	89
Interest in further education for self	86	83	13	76	62	76	15	83

Table 14
Effectiveness Ratings ("1" and "2")
On Program Dimensions

Parent Scholar	Option 1 N=96		Option 2 N=16		Option 4 N=66		Option 5 N=15	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
How often do you receive special training in classroom instruction?								
Once a week	27	28	3	19	23	35	4	27
Every other week	24	25	6	37	15	23	0	0
Once a month	12	12	6	37	2	3	0	0
Other	29	30	0	0	23	35	9	60
How effective is the training received								
Effective	78	81	12	75	46	70	11	73
Somewhat	14	14	1	6	12	18	1	6
Not at all	2	2	1	6	2	3	0	0
Clear about the specifics of the option	80	83	14	87	54	82	11	73
Enthusiastic about working in option	86	89	14	87	59	89	11	73
Option is effective for helping a child think for himself	69	72	10	62	53	80	11	73
Option is effective for helping a child relate to his age group	71	74	12	75	52	79	11	73
Option is effective for helping a child view school as a positive experience	67	70	10	62	50	76	12	80
Option provides an effective approach to Reading	68	71	13	81	52	79	9	60
Option provides an effective approach to Arithmetic	67	70	12	75	52	79	8	53
Option provides an effective approach to Social Studies	41	43	7	44	29	44	7	47

Table 14 (cont'd)
Effectiveness Ratings ("1" and "2")
On Program Dimension

Parent Scholar	Option 1 N=96		Option 2 N=16		Option 4 N=66		Option 5 N=15	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option provides an effective approach to Science	39	41	6	37	30	45	8	53
Option provides an effective approach to Handwriting Skills	76	79	13	81	43	65	10	67
Option provides an effective approach to Written Expression	51	53	8	50	32	48	5	33
Option provides an effective approach to Oral Expression	55	57	11	69	48	73	10	67
Option provides an effective approach to Creative Activities	57	59	13	81	50	76	10	67
Option has clarified ideas of what education should do for child	88	92	15	94	61	92	14	94
Option has increased interest in school	89	93	15	94	64	97	15	100
Option has increased interest in reaching the home	83	86	15	94	54	82	14	94
Instruct whole class								
never	47	49	4	25	30	45	11	73
occasionally	29	30	11	69	24	36	3	20
regularly	4	4	1	6	8	12	0	0
Instruct small groups								
never	1	1	1	6	1	1	0	0
occasionally	12	12	0	0	12	18	10	67
regularly	81	84	13	81	53	80	0	0
Instruct individual children								
never	10	10	3	19	2	3	1	6
occasionally	40	42	6	37	23	35	6	41
regularly	36	37	7	44	37	56	7	47
Would like Expansion Program continued	91	95	15	94	64	97	13	87
Are interested in further education for self, as a result of Expansion Program	81	84	16	100	52	79	12	80

APPENDIX B

Survey Tables

Table 1

TOTAL PROGRAM
(TITLE I EXPANSION/PRIMARY SKILLS)

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE MAY, 1976[1]

		N	%
1. Sex	Male	30	73
	Female	10	24
	No Response	1	2
2. Age	Under 35	3	7
	35-50	25	61
	Over 50	12	30
	No Response	1	2

3. How many years have you been principal of this school?

Years		
1-5	24	59
6-10	14	34
11-15	2	5
No Response	1	2

4. Years of experience as a principal:

1-5	15	37
6-10	15	37
11-15	9	22
16-20	2	5
No Response	0	0

[1]Due to rounding, percentages may not always add to 100.

5. Years of teaching experience:	N	%
1-5	1	2
6-10	11	27
11-15	14	34
16-20	8	20
Over 20	6	15
No Response	1	2

Please answer the following questions on a scale from 1-5 where 1 indicates a positive response and 5 a negative one.

	Closely Related 1		2		3		4		Not at all Related 5	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
6. How closely related is the instructional option to your teacher training background?	5	12	14	34	9	22	8	20	5	12
7. How closely related is your role in the instructional option to your administrative experience?	7	17	25	61	6	15	2	5	1	2
8. How closely related are the instructional option ideals to your education and training experience?	13	32	13	32	12	29	3	7	0	0
9. How closely is the instructional option related to your belief about how children learn?	15	37	16	39	7	17	2	5	0	0

10. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child <u>think for himself</u>?

VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
8	19	20	49	11	27	0	0	1	2	1	2

11. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child learn to relate to his age group?

VERY EFFECTIVE — NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE

1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10	23	24	57	6	15	2	5	0	0	0	0

12. How Effective is your instructional option for helping a child view school as a positive experience?

VERY EFFECTIVE — NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE

1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15	36	22	54	2	5	1	2	1	2	0	0

13. In general, how important do you think the pre-school experience is for success in the instructional option?

VERY IMPORTANT — NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT

1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
22	54	12	29	3	7	3	7	0	0	1	2

How well does the instructional option provide an effective approach to the following academic areas?

VERY WELL — POORLY

	1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
14. Reading	18	44	17	41	5	12	0	0	1	2	0	0
15. Arithmetic	15	37	18	44	7	17	0	0	1	2	0	0
16. Social Studies	7	17	19	46	9	22	2	5	1	2	3	7
17. Science	6	15	12	29	15	37	3	7	1	2	4	10
18. Handwriting Skills	13	32	16	39	9	22	2	5	1	2	0	0
19. Written Expression	10	24	14	34	12	29	0	0	2	5	3	7
20. Oral Expression	10	24	22	54	4	10	1	2	3	7	1	2
21. Creative Activities	9	22	20	49	7	17	1	2	2	5	2	5

How important has the instructional option been in:

	VERY IMPORTANT 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
22. Clarifying your ideas of what education should do for the child.	5	12	18	44	13	32	3	7	2	5	0	0
23. Increasing your interest in individualized instruction	9	22	18	44	10	24	1	2	3	7	0	0
24. Increasing your interest in the home.	13	32	12	29	11	27	3	7	2	5	0	0
25. Increasing your interest in teacher development.	13	32	15	37	7	17	3	7	2	5	1	2

Please indicate on the chart below the kinds of classroom help available to classes in your instructional option and how effective you think they are:

Type of Classroom Help:	Circle If Used in Classroom	VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
26. full time aide	1	33	80	6	15	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. parent volunteers	2	15	36	5	12	6	15	2	5	4	10	9	22
28. parent scholars	3	19	46	14	34	5	12	3	7	0	0	0	0

Please comment:

29. What effect in general, has F.T. had at your school in the following areas?

	VERY POSITIVE EFFECT 1		2		3		4		VERY NEGATIVE EFFECT 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Achievement	11	27	17	41	11	27	2	5	0	0	0	0
2. Parent Participation	14	34	17	41	6	15	3	7	1	2	0	0
3. Staff Development	13	32	21	51	6	15	0	0	1	2	0	0
4. Motivation of Instructional Personnel	9	22	23	56	7	17	0	0	2	5	0	0

Appendix B
Table 2

(TITLE I EXPANSION/PRIMARY SKILLS)

RESOURCE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE, MAY 1976[1]

		N	%
1. Sex	Male	1	7
	Female	14	93
	No Response	0	0
2. Age	Under 30	5	33
	30 - 50	10	67
	Over 50	0	0
	No Response	0	0

3. What is the highest level of school you completed?

BA	5	33
MA	6	40
MA+	4	27

4. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

(a) Years

0	0	0
Less than 2	0	0
2 - 5	0	0
5 - 10	8	53
More than 10	7	47
No Response	0	0

(b) Grades taught during this time.

	N	%		N	%
Kg.	7	47	4th	6	40
1st	6	40	5th	4	27
2nd	9	60	6th	4	27
3rd	8	53	7th	1	7
Other	2	14	8th	1	7

5. How long have you been working as a resource teacher in the expansion program?

0 - 6 months	0	0
6 months - 1 year	9	60
1 year - 2 years	6	40

[1]Due to rounding, percentages may not always add to 100.

6. How often do you receive staff development? (Circle one number for each option)

		Option I, N=11		Option II, N=2		Option IV, N=8	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Once a week	1	10	91	1	50	6	75
Every other week	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Once a month	3	1	9	0	0	0	0
Other		0	0	0	0	0	0
No Response		0	0	1	50	2	25

7. In your opinion, how effective is the staff development you receive?

		Option I, N=11		Option II, N=2		Option IV, N=8	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Very effective	1	8	73	0	0	4	50
Somewhat effective	2	3	27	0	0	3	37
Not at all effective	3	0	0	1	50	1	13
No Response		0	0	1	50	0	0

8. Please indicate the effectiveness of the various types of help available to classroom teachers.

	VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full time aides	15	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parent volunteers	4	27	2	13	1	7	0	0	0	0	8	53
Parent scholars	7	47	3	20	4	27	1	7	0	0	0	0

9. At this point in time, how clear are you about the specifics of each of the instructional options you work with?

	VERY CLEAR 1		2		3		4		TOTALLY UNCLEAR 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option 1	3	28	2	18	6	54	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 4	2	50	1	25	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0

10. At this point in time, how enthusiastic are you about working in each of the instructional options?

	VERY ENTHUSIASTIC 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL ENTHUSIASTIC 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option 1	4	36	5	45	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 4	1	25	2	50	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0

11. How closely is each of the instructional options related to your belief about how children learn?

	CLOSELY RELATED 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL RELATED 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option 1	3	28	6	54	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 4	3	72	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

12. How effective is each of the instructional options for helping a child think for himself?

	VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option 1	3	28	2	18	4	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	3	75	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0

13. How effective is each of the instructional options for helping a child learn to relate to his age group?

	VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option 1	2	18	4	36	4	36	0	0	0	0	1	9
Option 2	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	3	75	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0

14. How effective is each of the instructional options for helping a child view school as a positive experience?

	VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option 1	4	36	3	28	3	28	0	0	0	0	1	9
Option 2	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	3	75	0	0	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0

How well does each of the instructional options provide an effective approach to the following academic areas?

	VERY WELL 1		2		3		4		POORLY 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. Reading												
Option 1	7	64	2	18	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	9
Option 2	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Arithmetic												
Option 1	7	64	2	18	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	9
Option 2	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	4	50	4	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Social Studies												
Option 1	0	0	2	18	4	36	2	18	2	18	1	9
Option 2	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	4	50	4	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Resource Teacher

How well does each of the instructional options provide an effective approach to the following academic areas?

	VERY WELL 1		2		3		4		POORLY 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18. Science												
Option 1	0	0	1	9	4	36	3	28	2	18	1	9
Option 2	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	4	50	4	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Handwriting Skills												
Option 1	6	54	3	28	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	9
Option 2	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	3	37	4	50	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Written Expression												
Option 1	1	9	2	18	4	36	2	18	1	9	1	9
Option 2	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	3	37	3	37	1	13	1	13	0	0	0	0
21. Oral Expression												
Option 1	1	9	5	45	2	18	0	0	2	18	1	9
Option 2	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	5	63	3	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Creative Activities												
Option 1	1	9	2	18	3	28	2	18	2	18	1	9
Option 2	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Option 4	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Has working in the expansion program:

	YES 1		NO 2		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
23. Clarified your ideas of what education should do for the child?	15	71	6	28	0	0
24. Increased your interest in individualized instruction?	19	90	2	9	0	0
25. Increased your interest in reaching the home?	20	95	1	4	0	0

26. In general, how important do you think the pre-school experience is for success in the expansion program?

	VERY IMPORTANT 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Option 1	8	73	2	18	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0
Option 2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3	6	75	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	1	12

27. Would you like to see the expansion program continued?

		N	%
YES	1	15	100
NO	2	0	0
Don't Know	9	0	0
No Response		0	0

28. Please specify the reasons for your response to Question 27.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	5	9	6	10	1
%	33	60	40	67	7

Code	Reasons for Program Continuance/Discontinuance
1	Benefits children; good program, model, method; motivates children
2	Good curriculum; individualized instruction; teaches children to think for themselves; encourages responsibility
3	Extra services and programs for children; more personnel, materials, supplies in classroom; smaller class size
4	Benefits parents, home, community
5	Benefits teachers (Applies to Teachers' Questionnaire only) Benefits aides; provides employment for aides (Applies to Aides' Questionnaire only)

(TITLE I EXPANSION/PRIMARY SKILLS)

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE MAY, 1976[1]

Grade _____

		N	%
1. Sex	Male	3	1
	Female	236	98
	No Response	1	.4
2. Age	Under 30	91	38
	30 - 50	120	50
	Over 50	25	10
	No Response	4	2

3. What is the highest level of school you completed?

BA	149	62
MA	67	28
MA +	23	.9
No Response	1	.4

4. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

(a) Years

0	2	1
Less than 2	25	10
2-5	91	38
5-10	51	21
More than 10	71	30
No Response	0	0

(b) Grades taught during this time.

Kg.	50	21	4th 10	4
1st	63	26	5th 7	3
2nd	22	9	6th 5	2
3rd	21	8	7th 2	1
Other, please specify	30	12	8th 1	.4
No Response	0	0		

[1]Due to rounding, percentages may not always add to 100.

5. How many years have you taught at this particular school?

	N	%
0	9	4
Less than 2	72	30
2-5	62	26
5-10	58	24
More than 10	39	16
No Response	0	0

6. How often do you receive staff development? (Circle one number)

		N	%
Once a week	1	61	25
Every other week	2	24	10
Once a month	3	44	18
Other	4	92	38
No Response		19	8

7. In your opinion, how effective is the staff development you receive?

		N	%
Very effective	1	88	37
Somewhat effective	2	88	37
Not at all effective	3	37	15
No Response		27	11

8. Please indicate the effectiveness of the various types of classroom help available to you.

	VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full time aide	169	70	26	11	18	7	14	6	6	2	7	3
Parent volunteers	50	21	15	6	19	8	8	3	12	5	136	57
Parent scholars	99	41	42	18	60	25	18	7	8	3	13	5

Please Comment: _____

_____

_____

9. At this point in time, how clear are you about the specifics of the instructional option? (Circle one number on scale).

VERY CLEAR 1		2		3		4		TOTALLY UNCLEAR 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
84	35	74	31	54	22	15	6	9	4	4	2

10. At this point in time, how enthusiastic are you about working in this Instructional option?

VERY ENTHUSIASTIC								NOT AT ALL ENTHUSIASTIC			
1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
90	37	65	27	47	20	13	5	21	9	4	2

11. How closely is this instructional option related to your belief about how children learn?

CLOSELY RELATED								NOT AT ALL RELATED			
1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
75	31	75	31	53	22	20	8	9	4	8	3

12. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child <u>think for himself</u>?

VERY EFFECTIVE								NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE			
1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
54	22	88	37	63	26	13	5	12	5	10	4

13. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child <u>learn to relate to his age group</u>?

VERY EFFECTIVE								NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE			
1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
68	28	85	35	58	24	9	3	8	3	12	5

14. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child <u>view school as a positive experience</u>?

VERY EFFECTIVE								NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE			
1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
88	37	88	37	37	15	8	3	7	3	12	5

Classroom Teacher

How well does the instructional option provide an effective approach to the following academic areas?

	VERY WELL 1		2		3		4		POORLY 5		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15. Reading	110	46	84	35	26	11	4	2	7	3	9	4
16. Arithmetic.	88	37	85	35	42	17	7	3	8	3	10	4
17. Social Studies	56	23	56	23	69	29	19	8	13	5	27	11
18. Science	32	13	62	26	76	32	24	10	18	8	28	11
19. Handwriting Skills. . .	82	34	79	33	48	20	12	5	12	5	7	3
20. Written Expression . .	51	21	63	26	61	24	21	9	12	5	32	13
21. Oral Expression	91	38	66	28	51	21	7	3	7	3	18	8
22. Creative Activities . .	78	32	50	21	58	24	19	8	15	6	20	8

Has working in the instructional option:

	YES		NO		--	No Response	
	N	%	N	%		N	%
23. Clarified your ideas of what education should do for the child?	145	60	74	31		21	9
24. Increased your interest in individualized instruction?	194	81	35	14		11	4
25. Increased your interest in reaching the home?	159	66	65	27		16	6

26. In general, how important do you think the pre-school experience is for success in the instructional option?

VERY IMPORTANT 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
177	74	25	10	23	9	6	3	3	1	6	3

27. Would you like to see the Expansion Program continued?

		N	%
YES	1	188	78
NO	2	23	9
DON'T KNOW	3	23	9
NO RESPONSE		6	3

28. Please specify the reasons for your response to Question 27?

Less than a 10% response, therefore numbers were not given

GRADES	N	%
Kindergarten	119	49
1st Grade	103	43
1/2 spilt	14	6
No Response	4	2

Appendix B
Table 4

TOTAL PROGRAM
(TITLE I EXPANSION/PRIMARY SKILLS)

AIDE QUESTIONNAIRE MAY, 1976[1]

			N	%
1.	Sex	Male	5	2
		Female	215	98
		No Response	0	0
2.	Age	Under 30	58	26
		30 - 50	138	63
		Over 50	21	10
		No Response	3	1

3. What is the highest level of school you have completed?

Elementary	1	.4
9th Grade	0	0
10th Grade	4	2
11th Grade	19	9
12th Grade	140	64
Beyond High School	54	24
No Response	2	.9

4. Do you live in the immediate community of the school you are working in?

Yes	145	66
No	72	33
No Response	3	1

5. How many years have you worked as a classroom aide?

Less than 2	17	7
3 - 6	53	25
7 - 10	49	22
Over 10	23	10
No Response	78	35

4A

[1]Due to rounding, percentages may not always add to 100.

	N	%		N	%
6. What grades did you work with during this time?					
Kg.	33	15	4th	10	5
1st	39	17	5th	7	3
2nd	26	12	6th	6	3
3rd	12	5	7th	4	2
Other	3	1	8th	4	2
No Response	0	0			
7. How often do you receive staff development? (Circle one number)					
Once a week 1	71	32			
Every other week 2	42	19			
Once a month 3	43	20			
Other 4	52	24			
No Response	12	5			
8. In your opinion, how effective is the staff development you receive?					
Very effective 1	120	54			
Somewhat effective 2	70	32			
Not at all effective 3	13	6			
No Response	17	7			

9. At this point in time, how clear are you about the specifics of the instructional option? (Circle one number on scale).

VERY CLEAR 1		2		3		4		TOTALLY UNCLEAR 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
100	45	68	31	34	15	8	4	7	3	3	1

10. At this point in time, how enthusiastic are you about working in this Instructional option?

VERY ENTHUSIASTIC 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL ENTHUSIASTIC 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
141	64	43	19	28	13	6	3	1	.4	1	.4

11. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child think for himself?

VERY EFFECTIVE								NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE			
1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
85	39	99	45	32	14	1	.4	1	.4	2	1

12. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child learn to relate to his age group?

VERY EFFECTIVE								NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE			
1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
87	39	88	40	38	17	2	.9	0	0	5	2

13. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child view school as a positive experience?

VERY EFFECTIVE								NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE			
1		2		3		4		5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
89	40	81	37	41	19	3	1	0	0	6	3

How well does the instructional option provide an effective approach to the following academic areas?

		VERY WELL 1		2		3		4		POORLY 5		No Response	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
14.	Reading	118	54	69	31	19	9	5	2	0	0	9	4
15.	Arithmetic	101	46	78	35	30	14	5	2	0	0	4	2
16.	Social Studies	55	25	66	30	39	18	11	5	8	4	41	18
17.	Science	50	23	58	26	50	23	11	5	7	3	44	20
18.	Handwriting Skills	105	48	65	29	30	14	5	2	0	0	15	7
19.	Written Expression	69	31	61	28	49	22	9	4	7	3	25	11
20.	Oral Expression	94	43	70	32	36	16	6	3	1	.4	13	6
21.	Creative Activities	97	44	62	28	44	20	1	.4	1	.4	15	7

Aide

Has working in the instructional option:

	YES		NO		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
22. Clarified your ideas of what education should do for the child?	203	92	4	2	13	6
23. Increased your interest in school?	204	93	3	1	13	6
24. Increased your interest in reaching the home?	192	87	11	5	17	8

	NEVER 1		OCCASIONALLY 2		REGULARLY 3	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
25. Do you instruct the whole class?	31	14	160	73	13	13
26. Do you instruct small groups?	3	1	9	4	208	94
27. Do you instruct individual children?	7	3	80	36	132	60

28. Would you like to see the Expansion Program continued?

		N	%
Yes	1	207	94
No	2	0	0
Don't Know	3	9	4

29. Please specify the reasons for your response to Question 28.

Less than a 10% response, therefore numbers were not given

30. As a result of the Expansion Program, are you interested in further education for yourself?

		N	%
Yes	1	176	80
No	2	16	7
Don't Know	3	23	11
No Response		5	2

Appendix B
Table 5

TOTAL PROGRAM
(TITLE I EXPANSION/PRIMARY SKILLS)

PROGRAM PARENT SCHOLAR QUESTIONNAIRE, MAY, 1976[1]

		N	%
1. Sex	Male	3	1
	Female	185	96
	No Response	5	3
2. Age	Under 30	100	52
	30 - 50	85	44
	Over 50	3	1
	No Response	5	3

3. What is the highest level of school you have completed?

Elementary	14	7
9th Grade	9	5
10th Grade	11	6
11th Grade	30	16
12th Grade	93	48
Beyond High School	33	17
No Response	3	1

4. Do you live in the immediate community of the school you are working in?

Yes	184	95
No	9	5
No Response	0	0

[1]Due to rounding, percentages may not always add to 100.

5. How often do you receive special training in classroom instruction?

Once a week	1	57	29
Every other week	2	45	23
Once a month	3	14	7
Other	4	67	35
No Response		10	5

6. In your opinion, how effective is the training you receive?

Very effective	1	147	76
Somewhat effective	2	28	14
Not at all effective	3	5	2
No Response		13	7

7. At this point in time, how clear are you about the specifics of the instructional option? (Circle one number on scale).

VERY CLEAR 1		2		3		4		TOTALLY UNCLEAR 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
114	59	45	23	25	13	2	1	2	1	5	3

8. At this point in time, how enthusiastic are you about working in this Instructional option?

VERY ENTHUSIASTIC 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL ENTHUSIASTIC 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
140	72	32	17	16	8	0	0	1	.5	4	2

9. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child think for himself?

VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
86	44	57	29	36	19	4	2	1	.5	9	5

10. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child learn to relate to his age group?

VERY EFFECTIVE 1		2		3		4		NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5		No Response	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
92	48	54	28	28	14	6	3	2	1	11	6

11. How effective is your instructional option for helping a child view school as a positive experience?

VERY EFFECTIVE								NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE		No Response	
1		2		3		4		5			
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
97	50	42	22	33	17	7	4	2	1	12	6

How well does the instructional option provide an effective approach to the following academic areas?

		VERY WELL 1		2		3		4		POORLY 5		No Response	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
12.	Reading	89	46	52	27	30	15	7	4	1	.5	14	7
13.	Arithmetic	91	47	48	25	26	13	6	3	1	.5	21	11
14.	Social Studies	43	22	41	21	37	19	6	3	2	1	64	33
15.	Science	38	20	46	24	38	20	5	2	5	2	61	32
16.	Handwriting Skills	96	50	46	24	28	14	7	4	0	0	16	8
17.	Written Expression	61	32	40	21	44	23	12	6	2	1	34	18
18.	Oral Expression	77	40	47	24	32	17	4	2	1	.5	32	17
19.	Creative Activities	89	46	43	22	27	14	5	2	1	.5	30	15

Has working in the instructional option:

		YES		NO		No Response	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
20.	Clarified your ideas of what education should do for the child?	178	92	3	1	12	6
21.	Increased your interest in school?	183	95	3	1	7	4
22.	Increased your interest in reaching the home?	168	87	12	6	13	7

		NEVER 1		OCCASIONALLY 2		REGULARLY 3		N.R.	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
23.	Do you instruct the whole class?	97	50	64	33	12	6	20	10
24.	Do you instruct small groups?	9	5	29	15	150	78	5	2
25.	Do you instruct individual children?	17	9	75	39	67	35	34	18

26. Would you like to see the Expansion Program continued?

		N	%
Yes	1	183	95
No	2	0	0
Don't Know	3	9	5

27. Please specify the reasons for your response to Question 26.

Less than a 10% response, therefore numbers were not given

28. As a result of the Expansion Program, are you interested in further education for yourself?

		N	%
Yes	1	161	83
No	2	4	2
Don't Know	3	23	12
No Response		5	3

	N	%
K	91	47
1	86	44
½	5	3
K/1	1	.5
N/A	10	5